

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner and the Supervisory Examiner are thanked for giving the Applicant an in-person interview on August 3, 2004. During the interview, several distinguishable features of the claimed invention were discussed. The summary of arguments presented for a few of the distinguishable features are reproduced below for the Examiner's convenience. Agreement was reached that the Applicant will further clarify the claimed invention in order to expedite the prosecution. Accordingly, the Applicant has further clarified the claims.

Again, it is respectfully submitted that claimed invention is patentable over *Crelrier* and *Ellacott* for at least the following reasons:

(a) *Crelrier* does NOT teach or suggest determining whether one or more components of a class file have been marked in the class file for loading into said virtual machine (claim 1)

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is respectfully submitted that the recited sections of *Crelrier* (please see Office Action, page 3) do NOT teach or suggest this feature. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that *Crelrier* does NOT teach or suggest this feature. In fact, *Crelrier* teaches loading the entire class file into the virtual machine (*Crelrier*, Col., 17, lines 53-54, also see step 601 of Fig. 6). As such, it is respectfully submitted that *Crelrier* cannot possibly teach or suggest selectively loading one or more components of the class file (i.e., loading and not loading features recited in claim 1).

(b) *Crelrier* does NOT teach or suggest defining a load attribute in the class file that indicates that one or more components of the class file have been selected for loading into said virtual machine (claim 4)

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is respectfully submitted that the recited sections of *Crelrier* (please see Office Action, page 4, paragraph 8) do NOT teach or suggest marking by defining an attribute associated with a class (or class file). Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that *Crelrier* does NOT teach or suggest this feature because *Crelrier* teaches loading the entire class file into the virtual machine.

(c) *Crelrier* does NOT Teach or suggest that the load attribute is implemented as an attribute table and includes offsets of one or more components of the class file with respect to said class file (claim 7)

Based on the discussion above, it is respectfully submitted that *Crelrier* does NOT teach or suggest this feature

(d) *Ellacott* does NOT Teach or suggest that features recited in claim 8 or claim 9

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is respectfully submitted that the recited sections of *Ellacott* (please see Office Action, page 7, Paragraphs 23 and 24) do NOT teach or suggest these features. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that *Ellacott* does NOT teach these features. *Ellacott* pertains to a method for combining data from two or more database records (*Ellacott*, Col. 5, lines 4-5) As such, *Ellacott* does not even relate to class files.

Finally, it is very submitted that the combination of these recited features cannot possibly be taught or suggest by the cited because neither of the references provide a general guidance, motivation, or even a remote suggestion with respect to selectively loading a class file into a virtual machine.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. SUN1P816). Should the Examiner believe that

a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300